

Remarks:

Claims 26-31 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Frank.

Claim 26 has been amended to better differentiate the instant invention from Frank. Claims 27-29 depend on Claim 26 and should thus be allowable.

Claims 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Frank.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Frank teaches small eye "cups" for protection of the eyes while in a tanning salon. The eye cups are not even partially transparent. Col 2 lines 49-55 clearly state that the goal is complete light blockage. Frank does not teach a lens element. Frank does not teach a frame element. Frank does not teach a bow element but rather a head strap. It is hard to imagine a reference further from the instant invention.

The examiner points out that Frank addresses the "problem of conventional sunglasses" in that they "create untanned lines or streaks on the wearer's face..." Frank does not solve this problem but merely mentions it in his "Background of the Invention." Since the Frank case was issued in 1979 this demonstrates the "long felt need" for the instant invention.

New claims 32-35 have been added to further clarify the instant invention.

Marked Up Claims

26. Sunglasses comprising two lenses one for each of the left and right eye which lenses are secured each to a right and left frame element which frame elements are each secured to a right and left bow for securement to a wearer's ears which left and right bows are each at least partially transmissive to a predetermined wavelength of light and which bows are more transmissive to this predetermined wavelength of light than are the two lenses [and which frame elements are each less transmissive to this predetermined wavelength of light than are the lenses.]
27. The sunglasses of claim 26 in which the predetermined wavelength of light is in the ultraviolet-B range.
28. The sunglasses of claim 26 in which the predetermined wavelength of light is in the ultraviolet range.
29. The sunglasses of claim 26 in which part of the frame elements near the nose are at least partially transmissive to a predetermined wavelength of light.
30. Sunglasses comprising two lenses one for each of the left and right eye which lenses are secured each to a right and left frame element which frame elements are each secured to a right and left bow for securement to a wearer's ears which left and right bows are each at least partially transmissive to a predetermined wavelength of light and

which bows are more transmissive to this predetermined wavelength of light than at least some parts of the frame elements.

31. Sunglasses comprising two lenses one for each of the left and right eye which lenses are secured each to a right and left frame element which frame elements are each secured to a right and left bow for securement to a wearer's ears which left and right bows are each at least partially transmissive to light and which bows are more transmissive to light than at least some parts of the frame elements.
32. The sunglasses of claim 31 in which part of the bows contain polyvinylidene fluoride.
33. The sunglasses of claim 31 in which part of the bows contain a polyamide polymer.
34. The sunglasses of claim 31 in which part of the bows contain polyvinylidene fluoride.

In view of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims, original and new, patentably distinguish over the cited reference, whether taken singly or in combination. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims, withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Date: 3 Oct. 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Mark W. Kroll
493 Sinaloa Road
Simi Valley, CA 93065

818-493-2234

mark@krolls.org